

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,588	11/12/2003	Kevin W.R. Crispin	070601-0026	8985
31824 7590 07/01/2009 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 18191 VON KARMAN AVE. SUITE 500 IRVINE, CA 92612-7108			EXAMINER	
			ALEXANDER, LYLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

(1) <u>Lyle A. Alexander</u> .	(3) <u>Ms. Laub</u> .
(2) <u>Mr. Chun</u> .	(4)
Date of Interview: <u>08 June 2009</u> .	
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.
Claim(s) discussed: <u>all</u> .	
Identification of prior art discussed: all.	
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached.	g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amer allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached	
GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER	e last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS R OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS TERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
·	
/Lyle A Alexander/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03) Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' argued the cited prior art fails to teach the claimed colorimetric detector and optical reader. Further amendments were discussed to further distinguish the instant claims from the cited prior art by claiming a "second optical detector", a "second comparator" and additional input nodes. The Office will have to review the arguments and proposed amendments in light of the cited prior art and update the search. However, it appears these arguments and proposed amendments will overcome the art of record.